



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/529,759	04/18/2000	ERIC VIVIER	INN-113T	9965

23557 7590 01/13/2005

SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK
A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
PO BOX 142950
GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950

EXAMINER

SISSON, BRADLEY L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1634

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/529,759

Applicant(s)

VIVIER ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley L. Sisson

Art Unit

1634

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 84-124 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 84-115 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 116-124 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 25 October 2004.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 84-115 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally elected by applicant in their response of 15 October 2001 for the following reasons:
2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 84-107, drawn to an in vitro method of hybridizing, classified in class 436, subclass 94.
 - II. Claims 108-115, drawn to kits, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3.
 - III. Claims 116-124, drawn to an in vitro method for identifying the repertoire of Natural Killer Receptor (NKR) immunoreceptors, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are drawn to different methods that result in different end products.
4. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product

Art Unit: 1634

as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product of Group II can be used in a materially different process of using that product, e.g., Group III.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Since applicant has elected the invention of Group I, claims 24-55, drawn to a method for identifying the repertoire of NKR inhibitory immunoreceptors, claims 84-115 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 116-124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Attention is directed to the decision in *University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.* 68 USPQ2D 1424 (Fed. Cir. 2004) at 1428:

Art Unit: 1634

To satisfy the written-description requirement, the specification must describe every element of the claimed invention in sufficient detail so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the inventor possessed the claimed invention at the time of filing. *Vas-Cath*, 935 F.3d at 1563; see also *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572 [41 USPQ2d 1961] (Fed. Cir. 1997) (patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that “the inventor invented the claimed invention”); *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012 [10 USPQ2d 1614] (Fed. Cir. 1989) (“the description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed”). Thus, an applicant complies with the written-description requirement “by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious,” and by using “such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention.” *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572.

9. For convenience, claim 116, the only independent claim under consideration on the merits, is reproduced below.

Claim 116 (New): An *in vitro* method for identifying the repertoire of Natural Killer Receptor (NKR) immunoreceptors comprising:

- (i) preparing at least a pair of oligonucleotides, at least one being designated a 3' oligonucleotide and at least one other being designated a 5' oligonucleotide, comprising a consensus sequence obtained from the alignment of cDNA sequences encoding a target NKR immunoreceptor, said consensus sequence being unable to hybridize with the DNA or cDNA sequence of a NKR immunoreceptor counterpart;
- (ii) contacting a nucleic acid sample derived from a human subject with said at least a pair of oligonucleotides under hybridizing conditions; and
- (iii) detecting hybridization between the nucleic acid sample and said at least a pair of oligonucleotides.

10. For purposes of examination, claim 116 has been interpreted as encompassing, yet is not limited to, immunoreceptors p58.1, p58.2, p70.INH, p140.NH, NGG2A, and NKG2B receptors as found in humans. Said methods have also been interpreted as encompassing the use of

Art Unit: 1634

virtually any oligonucleotide as a primer, be it for the 3' or 5' position. Such breadth of interpretation is based on the recitation that one is to use oligonucleotides not yet known, but which are to be prepared such that they comprise "a consensus sequence obtained from the alignment of cDNA sequences encoding [any] target NKR immunoreceptor," regardless of its source (human or non-human). Claims 116-124 have also been interpreted as encompassing simultaneous identification of said repertoire in a virtually infinite number of samples, wherein said samples can range in heterogeneity, and content for any given target nucleic acid, and wherein said identification of each and every repertoire is conducted with a sample that is either bound or in solution, where no label is used. In those instances where a label is used, the claimed methods have been interpreted as encompassing performing said identification when unincorporated label is not removed from incorporated label.

11. As presently worded, one is to have "oligonucleotides" (probes) hybridize to nucleic acid that encodes any of immunoreceptors p58.1, p58.2, p70.INH, p140.INH, NGG2A, and NKG2B, but does not hybridize with any nucleic acid that encodes a "NKR activatory immunoreceptor." It is noted with particularity that the names "p58.1, p58.2, p70.INH, p140.INH, NGG2A, and NKG2B " are of proteins, and that the specification does not teach the amino acid sequence of each of these proteins, or equivalents, nor does the specification teach the nucleotide residue sequence is for same. Clearly, knowing the target nucleic acid sequence is critical to practicing a hybridization reaction, yet the specification does not disclose these essential starting materials and as such, applicant has not provided an adequate written description of the reagents used in the method, including oligonucleotides that are to somehow be derived.

12. Page 5, last line, bridging to page 6 of the specification states:

Art Unit: 1634

The invention provides, for the first time, means which make it possible to document, routinely in a medical or veterinary context, NKR and/or NKR counterpart repertoires, so as to be able to rapidly and effectively analyze physiological and pathological situations linked to these repertoires.

A review of the specification finds but two examples. Example 1, pages 17-22, describes the isolation of RNA from "cloned human NK cells phenotyped p50.2⁺ and/or p58.2⁺", the selection of primers and conducting polymerase chain reaction. Example 2, pages 22-24, describes conducting PCR on DNA isolated from "a population of p50.2⁺ transgenic mouse splenocytes." None of these examples, or any other portion of the specification has been found to provide an adequate written description of how a repertoire of NKR immunoreceptors is identified, and such information is in turn used, when the immunoreceptor is p58.1, p58.2, p70.INH, p140.INH, and the NKR counterpart receptor is p50.1, p50.2, p70.ACT, p140.ACT, respectfully.

1. The specification fails to provide an adequate written description of the various nucleic acid sequences represented by the various accession numbers as found in Claim 124. While the original drawings have been found to provide literal support for the accession numbers, the information to be represented by same has not been incorporated by reference and accordingly, cannot now be relied upon by applicant to fulfill the written description requirement. As set forth in *Advanced Display Systems Inc. v. Kent State University* (Fed. Cir. 2000) 54 USPQ2d at 1679:

Incorporation by reference provides a method for integrating material from various documents into a host document--a patent or printed publication in an anticipation determination--by citing such material in a manner that makes it clear that the material is effectively part of the host document as if it were explicitly contained therein. *See General Elec. Co. v. Brenner*, 407 F.2d 1258, 1261-62, 159 USPQ 335, 337 (D.C. Cir. 1968); *In re Lund*, 376 F.2d 982, 989, 153 USPQ 625, 631 (CCPA 1967). **To incorporate material by reference, the host document must identify with detailed particularity what specific material it incorporates and clearly indicate where that**

Art Unit: 1634

material is found in the various documents. See *In re Seversky*, 474 F.2d 671, 674, 177 USPQ 144, 146 (CCPA 1973) (providing that incorporation by reference requires a statement “clearly identifying the subject matter which is incorporated and where it is to be found”); *In re Saunders*, 444 F.2d 599, 602-02, 170 USPQ 213, 216-17 (CPA 1971) (reasoning that a rejection or anticipation is appropriate only if one reference “expressly incorporates a particular part” of another reference); *National Latex Prods. Co. v. Sun Rubber Co.*, 274 F.2d 224, 230, 123 USPQ 279, 283 (6th Cir. 1959) (requiring a specific reference to material in an earlier application in order to have that material considered a part of a later application); cf. *Lund*, 376 F.2d at 989, 13 USPQ at 631 (holding that a one sentence reference to an abandoned application is not sufficient to incorporate from the abandoned application into a new application).

Attention is also directed to MPEP 608.01(p)I, which, in pertinent part, is reproduced below:

Mere reference to another application, patent, or publication is not an incorporation of anything therein into the application containing such reference for the purpose of the disclosure required by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. *In re de Seversky*, 474 F.2d 671, 177 USPQ 144 (CCPA 1973). In addition to other requirements for an application, the referencing application should include an identification of the referenced patent, application, or publication. Particular attention should be directed to specific portions of the referenced document where the subject matter being incorporated may be found. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, the cited accession numbers are not considered to have been properly incorporated by reference and as such, have not been considered with any effect towards their fulfilling, either in part or in whole, the enablement, written description, or best mode requirements of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

13. The specification has not been found to provide an adequate written description of every element of the claimed invention in sufficient detail so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the inventor possessed the claimed invention at the time of filing. Accordingly, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, claims 58-83 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Art Unit: 1634

Claims 116-124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As set forth in *Enzo Biochem Inc., v. Calgene, Inc.* (CAFC, 1999) 52 USPQ2d at 1135, bridging to 1136:

To be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without 'undue experimentation.' " *Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, A/S*, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Whether claims are sufficiently enabled by a disclosure in a specification is determined as of the date that the patent application was first filed, see *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986).... We have held that a patent specification complies with the statute even if a "reasonable" amount of routine experimentation is required in order to practice a claimed invention, but that such experimentation must not be "undue." See, e.g., *Wands*, 858 F.2d at 736-37, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 ("Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.' ") (footnotes, citations, and internal quotation marks omitted). In *In re Wands*, we set forth a number of factors which a court may consider in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation. These factors were set forth as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. *Id.* at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. We have also noted that all of the factors need not be reviewed when determining whether a disclosure is enabling. See *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., Ltd.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1213, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (noting that the *Wands* factors "are illustrative, not mandatory. What is relevant depends on the facts.").

14. It is well settled that one cannot enable that which they do not yet possess. As set forth above, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention so as to reasonably suggest that applicant was in possession of the invention at the time of filing.

Accordingly, claims 116-124 are not enabled by the specification.

Conclusion

15. Rejections and/or objections that appeared in the prior Office action and not repeated hereinabove have been withdrawn.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


17. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley L. Sisson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0751. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones can be reached on (571) 272-0745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1634

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Bradley L. Sisson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634

BLS
10 January 2005